

Apportionment Status Report  
CMAQ and RSTP  
(as of July 31, 2008)

AB 1012  
Balance entering the 3rd Year  
(from FFY 2005)\*  
Rural County Summary

\*Previously referred to as Cycle 8

Region	CMAQ Unobligated 7/31/2008 Delivery Balance <sup>1</sup>	CMAQ Amount Subject to AB 1012 Reprogramming 11/01/2007 <sup>2</sup>	RSTP Unobligated 7/31/2008 Delivery Balance <sup>1</sup>	RSTP Amount Subject to AB 1012 Reprogramming 11/01/2007 <sup>2</sup>
<b>Rural County Information:</b>				
Del Norte	-	-	-	-
Humboldt	-	-	-	-
Lake	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	-	-	-	-
Lassen	-	-	-	-
Modoc	-	-	-	-
Plumas <sup>6</sup>	-	-	(1,873)	-
Shasta	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	-	-	-
Tehama	-	-	-	-
Trinity	-	-	-	-
Colusa	-	-	-	-
El Dorado <sup>4</sup>	-	-	-	-
Glenn	-	-	-	-
Nevada <sup>3</sup>	615,120	-	-	-
Placer <sup>4</sup>	-	-	-	-
Sierra	-	-	-	-
Inyo	-	-	-	-
Mono	-	-	-	-
Alpine	-	-	-	-
Amador <sup>3</sup>	1,185,449	218,499	-	-
Calaveras <sup>3</sup>	591,056	-	-	-
Mariposa <sup>3</sup>	383,487	-	-	-
Tuolumne <sup>3</sup>	555,176	-	-	-
Imperial (SCAG) <sup>3,5</sup>	1,254,389	-	2,978,723	-
<b>Rural Combined Totals:</b>	<b>\$4,584,677</b>	<b>218,499</b>	<b>\$2,976,850</b>	<b>-</b>

**Balances now include:**

- \* FFY 2006-07 Advanced/Estimated Apportionments for CMAQ and RSTP
- \* Difference between Advanced/Estimated Apportionments vs. Actual Apportionment for CMAQ & RSTP for FFY 2003-04, FFY 2004-05 and FFY 2005-06
- \* Recission amounts for each region as required by PL 110-5 on March 19, 2007.
- \* RSTP Exchange for FFY 06/07 effective May 31, 2007
- \* 2nd Recission amounts- CMAQ only- for each region as required by Notice: N 45610.647 on June 20, 2007

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> Indicates all apportionments not yet obligated.

<sup>2</sup> Totals reflect balances in the third year.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning in FFY 2006, these rural regions are now receiving CMAQ apportionments.

<sup>4</sup> Balances for El Dorado County and Placer County have been reconciled to correct negative balances shown due to a coding error.

<sup>5</sup> Balances for Imperial adjusted to reflect a payback from SACOG per MOU

<sup>6</sup> RSTP Exchange for FFY 06/07 was calculated on the Estimate vs Actual RSTP apportionment. Because the Actual apportionment was lower than the Estimate, the RSTP exchange from Plumas was higher than it should have been. The RSTP exchange for FFY 07/08 absorbed some of the negative balance and the exchange for FFY 08/09 should absorb the remaining balance.

Assumes the use of all previous balances.

The regional balances reflect activities that have been recorded in the Department's Local Assistance accounting system. There may be a delay between the FHWA authorization and the recording of the transaction in the Department's Local Assistance accounting system.